Office - Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
FEB 13 1984
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS,
CLERK

No. 83-1163

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1983

BOLAR PHARMACEUTICAL CO.,

Petitioner,

v.

CIBA-GEIGY CORPORATION,

Respondent.

On A Petition For A Writ of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Third Circuit

BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE* THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SENIOR CITIZENS

JAMES F. FLUG, ESQUIRE
DIANE BARZMAN, ESQUIRE
LOBEL, NOVINS & LAMONT
1523 L Street, N.W.
Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 628-0066
Attorneys for Amicus Curiae

PRESS OF BYRON S. ADAMS PRINTING, INC., WASHINGTON, D.C. (202) 347-8203

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	i
STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE	1
ARGUMENT	4
I. The Lower Court Decisions Impede Competition By Granting A Perpetual Monopoly On The Reproduction Of A Feature Which Contributes Directly To The Sale Of The Underlying Product	4
II. The Lower Court Decision Grants A Monopoly On The Only Useful Name For A Prescription Drug	5
III. The Lower Court Decision Interferes With State Law Policy Promoting Use Of Generic Drugs	7
CONCLUSION	8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES:	Page
Kellogg Co. v. *National Biscuit Co.*, 305 U.S. 111 (1938)	4
Inwood Laboratories, Inc. et al. v. *Ives Laboratories, Inc.*, 456 U.S. 844 (1982)	4, 5, 7
Bayer Co., Inc. v. *United Drug Co.*, 272 F. 505 (S.D.N.Y. 1921)	6
STATUTES:	
15 U.S.C. §§ 1064(c), 1065(4)	6
21 U.S.C. § 352(n)	6

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1983

No. 83-1163

BOLAR PHARMACEUTICAL CO.,

Petitioner,

v.

CIBA-GEIGY CORPORATION,

Respondent.

On A Petition For A Writ of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Third Circuit

---

BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE* THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SENIOR CITIZENS

INTEREST OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SENIOR CITIZENS

The National Council of Senior Citizens (NCSC) of 925 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20002, pursuant to Rule 36.1 of the Rules of the United States Supreme Court, files the attached brief Amicus Curiae on a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

The National Council of Senior Citizens ("NCSC") is a not-for-profit membership organization of over four thousand affiliated local associations having a membership of over four million senior citizens.

The National Council of Senior Citizens advocates the interests of senior citizens concerning governmental regulations, legislation and judicial decisions in areas of health care that affect the elderly, particularly including decisions which will adversely affect the health care interests of senior citizens.

The National Council of Senior Citizens was initially formed as an advocate for proper health care for the elderly; it fought for enactment of the legislation establishing the Medicare program, and has vigorously opposed efforts to dilute that program. Recognizing that retired persons and other senior citizens cannot expect medical care superior to or more cost-effective than that which is available to all of the population, the four million plus senior citizens it represents are vitally interested in the quality and the cost of health care programs for all Americans.

One aspect of medical care that places a particularly heavy burden upon the elderly is the cost of medication. This cost is not adequately covered by Medicare or by the most widely used Medicare supplemental health insurance policies. Moreover, the cost of medication has been increasing more rapidly than cost of living increases in Social Security, upon which many elderly persons rely as a principal source of income.

It has been estimated that the elderly spend nearly 20 times more on pharmaceutical expenses, as a percentage of income, than the rest of the population. The National Council of Senior Citizens has both anecdotal and statistical evidence that the high cost of drugs is a burden upon the elderly, which may in some cases even prevent senior citizens from following drug regimens prescribed for them. Often such drug regimens control symptoms or

manage diseases so as to prevent more costly medical treatment.

The decision of the Third Circuit in this case adversely affects the rights of senior citizens to purchase medication from competitive sources in the accustomed appearance which they use to recognize and identify their drugs. The elderly do not want to be forced to pay for exorbitant and unnecessary "detailing" and advertising costs and profits to a former patent monopolist, long after a patent has expired on a drug they need in recognizable form to maintain their health. The Third Circuit decision artificially establishes one monopoly source for formerly patented drugs in their accustomed form.

NCSC has considerable anecdotal evidence from its members of the hardships which artificially supported drug prices can impose upon them. NCSC, and the other major membership organizations of the elderly, provide pharmacy services at discount prices for their members and rely on the competition provided by generic drug manufacturers to reduce drug costs.

Appearance is important to medicine users. Many of the elderly follow their regimen by color codes—the "blue pill" and the "green pill" in the morning, and the "orange pill" at bedtime, etc. This habit is strong among many users, but is particularly strong among the elderly. The lower court decision will block the availability of reasonably priced generic drugs to NCSC members, to others of the elderly population, and to all citizens.

Not only does the lower court decision grant a monopoly on the very appearance by which senior citizens use to recognize and identify their medication, but it also grants a monopoly on the *only useful* name provided by the former patent monopolist for the drug.

For these reasons, the NCSC believes that the intent of Congress and of the generic drug substitution laws of the various States is being circumvented, and the health of its members and other senior citizens is being endangered, by the lower court decisions.

ARGUMENT

I. The Lower Court Decisions Impede Competition By Granting A Perpetual Monopoly On The Reproduction Of A Feature Which Contributes Directly To The Sale Of The Underlying Product

Consumers, particularly senior citizens, recognize and identify their drugs by the accustomed appearance of the drugs. When drug patents expire, senior citizens should be entitled to have competitors manufacture drugs in the accustomed dosage form of the drug. This right was clearly established by this Court in *Kellogg Co.* v. *National Biscuit Co.*, 305 U.S. 111 (1938) at page 120:

> Where an article may be manufactured by all, a particular manufacturer can no more assert exclusive rights *in a form in which the public has become accustomed to see the article* and which, in the minds of the public, is primarily associated with the article rather than a particular producer, than it can in the case of a name with similar connections in the public mind. [emphasis supplied]

In its recent decision in *Inwood Laboratories, Inc. et al.*, v. *Ives Laboratories, Inc.*, 456 U.S. 844 (1982), this Court properly recognized the utility of drug appearance for drug identification, health and safety purposes unrelated to any trademark purpose, in affirming the District Court decision:

> . . . that the blue and blue-red colors were functional to patients as well as to doctors and hospitals: many elderly patients associate color with therapeu-

> tic effect; some patients co-mingle medications in a container and rely on color to differentiate one from another; colors are of some, if limited, help in identifying drugs in emergency situations; and use of the same color for brand name drugs and their generic equivalents helps avoid confusion on the part of those responsible for dispensing drugs. [456 U.S. at 853.]

The NCSC fully supports these factors of drug appearance utility approved by this Court in the *Inwood* case. These factors have been improperly disregarded by the lower courts in the Petitioner's case. The outcome of these cases should not depend on which side of the Hudson River a "brand name" drug company decides to sue a generic drug manufacturer. The NCSC respectfully urges the Court to establish, throughout the United States, that the appearance of a drug product, which is the means consumers have had to recognize and identify the drug during the term of a patent monopoly, cannot continue to be monopolized under the trademark laws after expiration of a patent.

II. The District Court Decision Grants A Monopoly On The Only Useful Name For A Prescription Drug

The District Court, in order to support its injunction, held that "Hydralazine Hydrochloride and Hydrochlorothiazide" is the generic name for the drug in suit. However, the only useful name known by consumers is "Apresazide", the claimed brand name.

None of the Ciba-Geigy's advertisments promoting "Apresazide" shows a useful generic name. Contrary to the court decision, a complicated list of ingredients—"Hydralazine Hydrochloride and Hydrochlorothiazide"—is not a useful generic name for senior citizens, or other persons, to remember and use as the name of their drug.

This decision conflicts with the policies of the Trademark laws and Food, Drug and Cosmetic laws by granting respondent a monopoly on the only useful name for a prescription drug. When enacting the trademark laws, Congress required that a name which is or becomes the "common descriptive name" of a drug not be monopolized as a trademark. 15 U.S.C. §§ 1064(c), 1065(4). Later, in 1962, because of drug companies' failures to list the generic name, or because of listing it in type too small a size, and because of abuses such as the spectacle of a large manufacturer of drugs failing to designate any generic name at all, Congress enacted 21 U.S.C. § 352(n) to require all prescription drug promotion to have a generic name printed in type at least half as large as that used for the claimed tradename.[1]

Accordingly, it is the policy of the Trademark laws and the 1962 Amendments to the Food, Drug and Cosmetic laws to require "brand name" drug companies to provide and promote a generic drug name which can be remembered and used easily by persons who do not have a degree in pharmaceutical chemistry. The only useful name provided by Ciba-Geigy for senior citizens and other consumers is "Apresazide," which must necessarily be used as "the name for a drug in whose curative properties they had got confidence" *Bayer Co., Inc.* v. *United Drug Co.*, 272 F. 505, 510 (S.D.N.Y. 1921) (L.Hand). The decision of the lower courts frustrate the policy of these laws.

---

[1] Respondent's advertising of its Singoserp, Nupercaine and Privine products was cited in Congress as examples of the practices which were to be prevented by the 1962 Amendments. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Committee on Judiciary, 87th Cong., 2nd Sess. (3374-3403) (1962) Trial R. at 982, 987-990.

III. The Lower Court Decision Interferes With State Law Policy Promoting Use Of Generic Drugs

The lower court decision also interferes with the policy of state generic drug substitution laws enacted by 49 states. Although the lower court acknowledges that the known appearance of a drug facilitates patient acceptance and generic substitution by doctors and pharmacists, which is the purpose of the state generic substitution laws, the decision nevertheless prohibits the manufacture and sale of such drugs.

That the judicial grant of a drug appearance monopoly interferes with the state substitution laws was argued by the New York Attorney General in his Amicus Brief in the *Inwood* case, and was acknowledged by Justice White in his concurring opinion in *Inwood Laboratories, Inc. et al.* v. *Ives Laboratories, Inc.*, 456 U.S. 844, 861 (1982):

> Preventing the use of generic drugs of the same color to which customers had become accustomed in their prior use of the brand name product interferes with the important state policy, expressed in New York and 47 other states, of promoting the substitution of generic formulations.

CONCLUSION

Amicus has a strong interest in encouraging competition within the pharmaceutical industry. Granting a perpetual monopoly on product appearance despite its functional character would seriously erode such competitive forces.

WHEREFORE, the National Council of Senior Citizens respectfully requests that this court grant the Petitioner's request for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES F. FLUG
DIANE BARZMAN

LOBEL, NOVINS & LAMONT
1523 L Street, N.W.
Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 628-0066

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae

February 13, 1984
Washington, D.C.